

## Tur Langton Neighbourhood Plan

### Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	<b>7B</b> Built Environment	<b>H3</b> Building Design Principles	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement for developments in the Parish to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). The use of SuDS would help to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.	Noted	None
2	<b>7C</b> Natural and Historic Environment	<b>ENV 1</b> Protection of Local Green Spaces	Anglian Water	<p><u>Sites 417 and 418</u>: There are existing sewers in the ownership of Anglian Water within the boundaries of these designated local green spaces.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that Policy ENV 1 should be amended to include reference to the circumstances in which development would be permitted in the designated local green spaces included utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water</p>	The policy rules out development in the designated areas other than in 'very special circumstances'. It will be up to the applicant in any planning application to demonstrate that the circumstances are 'special'.	
3	<b>7C</b> Natural and Historic Environment	<b>ENV 9 Rivers and Flooding</b>	<b>Anglian water</b>	Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement for developments in the Parish to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into the design of new developments. The use of SuDS would help to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.	Noted	None
4	<b>General</b>		Natural England	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</p> <p>We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Noted	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
5	General		Historic England	<p>Your Neighbourhood Plan falls within Tur Langton conservation area and includes a number of designated heritage assets including 1 GII* listed building, 15 GII listed buildings and 2 scheduled ancient monuments. It will be important that the strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>The conservation officer at Harborough District Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. At this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area. If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Leicestershire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (<a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a> &lt;<a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a>&gt;). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority's local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.</p>	Noted. The conservation area is covered by national planning policies and through HDC's Core Strategy.	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-</p> <p><a href="http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/">http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/</a></p>		
6	Page 38, Paragraph 11, Map 7A	<b>ENV3</b> Important woodland, trees and hedges	A resident	<p>We do not consider the tree at the entrance to Buckey Lane (near our house) to be of arboricultural and landscape significance because it has the disease of miner which is now very apparent, it has appeared earlier this year. When the leaves fall we have to clear them up although the tree is not on our land. Throughout the year, especially in spring, our vehicles (which are parked in front of our house) are covered in sticky deposit and muck from the tree and birds who roost in it, thus costing us money to have them continually cleaned. The telegraph wires go through it and could be brought down at any time. In our opinion a tree growing to the size it now is should never have been planted so close to the road.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. We have amended the policy to remove the description of 'significance' this and other trees, in favour of a tree survey needing to be undertaken prior to development activity.</p>	<p>New policy to say 'Trees and hedgerows of good arboricultural, biodiversity and amenity value should be protected from loss or damage as a result of development. Wherever possible, they should be integrated into the design of development proposals and their enhancement will be supported. Proposals</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
						should be accompanied by a tree survey of at least (currently) BS5837 standard, or the standard in force at the time, that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees’.
7	General		A resident	The detail on the maps are too small, it is difficult to figure some of them out even with a magnifying glass. It would be better if they were all the same size as the map on page 28	Thank you for pointing this out. We will make sure that high resolution maps are available in the Submission version of the NP	High resolution maps to be provided
8	Section 7, Page 23		A landowner	We understand the limits of development, illustrated with the red line on page 23 depicts the garden boundary. We believe this is mis-represented for the houses on Shangton Road, who utilise land outside this red line as their garden. As such we propose the red line is changed to the blue line in the attached photo <a href="#">(see below)</a>	Thank you. The limits to development have been set based on a methodology that has been applied consistently. The revised LtD follows defined boundaries, and amending it as suggested to include paddocks and non-garden areas which	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
					relate better to the countryside would have a detrimental impact across the built-up area of the parish.	
9	General		A landowner	Reads well	Thank you.	None
10	7A Strategy	S2 Limits to Dev	A resident	<p>I happened to go onto the village website on the evening of Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> June and spotted the draft plan. I am strongly opposed to the proposed plan as affects our border which extends the limit of development from the south west corner of our plot in a diagonal line across the field. We were completely in the dark about the proposal within the draft Village Plan to change the line of development to the significant detriment to ourselves. The health challenges both my wife and I face meant we were unable to attend the two briefing sessions that were held. Unfortunately no-one had informed us about the proposed change which has such a significant effect on us.</p> <p>My comments are as follows:</p> <p>The map within the draft Village Plan is based upon a long out of date map concerning Carlton Cottage. Significant additions were made in 2000 of a granny annex which extends both to the west and east to the rear of the property, and a double garage situated roughly halfway between the house and the north end of the plot.</p> <p>A key feature and amenity of our property are the unfettered views both to the south and to north looking up to Carlton Clump. There is Restrictive Covenant still in place dated 15 December 1992 “to erect a post and four rail motorway style fence”. Improvements and development to our property have therefore all been made with the openness and views in mind. There are 6 sets of windows along the west side of the property including as part of a conservatory. All are relatively close to the border, at</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>On undertaking a review of the Limits to Development and the potential location of housing sites, the Parish Council has agreed to remove this potential site from the Neighbourhood Plan and the Limits to Development will be redrawn accordingly.</p>	Limits to Development revised as proposed.

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>one point as little as four or five feet from the fence. The views looking north from the three main bedroom windows at the front west end of the house are particularly exceptional.</p> <p>Our property occupies an unusual triangular plot. The area next to the west fence is not just a border for us but forms our main garden amenity. It is effectively our semi-private back garden as we also only have but a very small courtyard garden at the rear. Keeping everything tidy we even mow the field strip to the west of the fence regularly.</p> <p>I believe therefore that the limit to development should continue to run along the whole of the border side our property that borders the field, and in particular along the whole of the fence on west side of our plot.</p> <p>I have attached a few photos of the garden and the house to illustrate some of the above points.  <a href="#">see below</a></p>		
11	General		National Grid	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i></p> <p>Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact <a href="mailto:plantprotection@nationalgrid.com">plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</a></p> <p><b>Key resources / contacts</b></p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and</p>	Noted	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>transmission assets via the following internet link:  <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</a></p> <p>The electricity distribution operator in Harborough District Council is Western Power Distribution. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at:  www.energynetworks.org.uk  Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure.</p>		
12	General		The Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for giving the Environment Agency the opportunity to comment on your Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Further to my colleague Geoff Platts response to your emerging Plan dated 10 July 2015, we are satisfied that the policies proposed are sufficient to cover those environmental constraints effecting the Local Plan area and which fall within the Environment Agency's remit.</p> <p>We therefore have no further comment to make.</p>	Noted.	None.
13			A landowner	<p>I am the owner of land that is directly connected and within the village of Tur Langton and I write to you in response to the Tur Langton Draft Neighbourhood plan – Statutory Consultation period. The land in question is noted in your plan as area 240.</p> <p>I raise a number of serious concerns about how the parish council has managed the process of developing the neighbourhood plan particularly in relation to the <b>'process for identifying suitable locations for residential development'</b> and the proposed redrawing of the <b>'limits to development'</b>. This is in relation to how TLPC has managed the communication and notification process; its failure to include all correspondence and the questionable basis for how the recommendations in the plan have</p>		None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	7A Strategy	S2 Limits to Dev		<p>been made.</p> <p>I also comment and raise questions about the proposed '<b>Local Green Spaces</b>' I raise questions about the recommendations that the council are proposing and why these appear to directly and positively affect members of the parish council and exclude others.</p> <p><b>The process for identifying suitable locations for residential development' and the proposed redrawing of the limits to development.</b></p> <p>I was initially made aware of the Neighbourhood plan by residents of the village and was subsequently contacted by TLPC as land owner and former resident that a meeting was to take place within the week to discuss the outline of the Neighbourhood plan process. Given the timescale of the notice for the meeting which was held on 9th July 2015 I could not attend. I followed up with both yourself as Clerk and the Chairperson of TLPC to request information and plans about the meeting and the outcome. Eventually I was told that the meeting was just sharing information and no minutes or outcomes were available. I then requested updates in the following months/years.</p> <p>In 2016 I was then asked, as land owner, whether I wanted to propose land within the village that at some unspecified time could be made available for small scale residential development. I did propose and confirm that my land (area 240) could be made available for this purpose directly to the Chairperson.</p> <p>At the village meeting which was held in Feb 2017 I noticed that the land in question had NOT been included in those areas proposed for limited development. Five areas of land had been included and TLPC asked residents to use green dots to identify those areas that, in their view, were suitable to be identified for limited development and red dots to</p>	<p>Noted. This was the first of a number of engagement processes and the analysis was made available on the PC website.</p> <p>An email from one of the owners of this land in August 2016 stated that there were 'no current plans for development but in theory some of the field on Cranoe Road 'could' be used for small scale development'. The writer was asked to</p>	



No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>identify those areas that should not. Even though my land had not been included by TLPC residents identified it as a good candidate for development by applying green dots on the site and making positive anecdotal comments about its suitability above other sites that were identified as can be seen in your supporting information.</p> <p>At the meeting I asked TLPC members why my area of land had not been included and was told that this was an error and if I sent details of the site in question again it would be included in the final analysis. I immediately sent and again confirmed details of the area of land in question directly to the chairperson who confirmed that this would be included.</p> <p>The plan that you have produced does not include any reference to this and does not include my land in the process. TLPC are attempting to redraw the limits to development on the basis of reviewing only the 5 sites excluding other suitable sites including my own.</p> <p>In the Draft Neighbourhood plan document you make a comment on page 23 'No other sites were put forward or were considered'. This is completely false and incorrect and is misleading to the reader. TLPC and its members were fully aware about the land that I had proposed. Documented correspondence will confirm the series of events that I outline above.</p> <p>In my view the land that I identified is extremely suitable for limited development as it possesses the following important attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is directly located next to the village and is connected to existing housing</li> <li>• It is located on the Craneo Road which has the lowest flow of traffic of all roads in Tur Langton and is the least busy at all times of the day compared to the other roads in the</li> </ul>	<p>supply details of the boundaries to the land in question. No such plan was forthcoming, therefore the land was not included in the open event which was held in February 2017.</p> <p>These were the sites that came forward in the timescales required.</p> <p>The Parish Council has been in correspondence with each of the three joint landowners.</p> <p>All the sites confirmed in the stated timescales were considered.</p> <p>All sites were subject to an assessment which is available in the supporting information.</p>	

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has good existing access directly from the Cranoe Road with good visibility for vehicular manoeuvring in both directions</li> <li>• Any development could follow the natural existing line of property along the Cranoe Road</li> <li>• It would NOT constitute so called back land development</li> <li>• It enjoys an edge of the village location and would be a natural extension of the village</li> </ul> <p>I compare this with the characteristics of the some of the other sites that TLPC have chosen:</p> <p><b>Site 1 North of village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on a notoriously busy road (B6047) that has had a number of fatalities due to speed and poor visibility along the road</li> <li>• Located on a dangerous corner with poor visibility for vehicular manoeuvring</li> <li>• Poor positing of access that has been recently created</li> <li>• Was not well supported at the village meeting</li> <li>• Statements made in the plan document that this site was developed before are completely false</li> </ul> <p><b>Site 4 West of village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on a busy road</li> <li>• Located on a dangerous corner with poor visibility for vehicular manoeuvring</li> </ul> <p><b>Site 3 South of village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on a notoriously busy road that has had a number of fatalities due to speed and poor visibility along the road</li> <li>• Located on the junction of the B6047 and Cranoe Road</li> </ul> <p>I note that some of the land owners of the sites that are set to benefit from redrawing of the limits to development are members</p>	<p>The proposed three sites have been reduced to two. The least popular being removed.</p> <p>The suitability of further development in the parish will be considered at formal review of the Neighbourhood Plan which should take place in 2022 or before.</p>	

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	<p><b>7C</b> Natural and Historic Environment</p>	<p><b>ENV 1</b> Protection of Local Green Spaces</p>		<p>of TLPC. I therefore conclude that the process for identifying suitable land for limited development has been poorly managed and I'm concerned that the area of land that I put forward has been purposefully excluded from both the village meeting and the plan preparation in order to satisfy some other means. It raises such questions that make this element of the Neighbourhood plan extremely questionable and therefore I cannot see any basis of support for redrawing the limits to development in this manner and request that this process be reassessed by an independent assessor.</p> <p><b>Local Green Space</b></p> <p>The plan attempts to classify the area of land 240 as a Local Green Space however I critically question the basis for such a classification. You have somewhat conveniently excluded from the field in question site 2 which you included as one of the sites put forward for limited development. I note also that site 1 has been excluded from area 239 with the remaining area of 239 being classified as Local green space due to its 'Ridge and Furrow' nature. I remind you that both sites 1 and 2 that you have excluded are part of area 239 and 240 respectively and enjoy the same characteristics. How can one part be proposed as a development site and the same land be assessed as a Local Green Space. It is at best illogical. Both 239 and 240 were purchase by me as 2 fields.</p> <p>Area 240 of the land does enjoy sporting right benefits and has been used as such over many years.</p> <p>You suggest that you have used the NPPF 2012 criteria for assessing local green space in order to make this assessment but I question, particularly given my comments above, why these areas have been included above other more obvious and more suitable areas that surround the village. I strongly disagree with this classification and request that a review of all the locations be</p>	<p>The Parish Council refutes this suggestion. It undertook an open and transparent process prior to relaxing the Limits to Development.</p> <p>These two sites very clearly have different characteristics to the area of land (240).</p> <p>All areas of open space were assessed and the scoring system is available to see in the Environmental Inventory.</p>	

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>prepared independently so that the assessment of each criteria can be transparent.</p> <p>In summary I strongly object to the redrawing of the limits to development and I believe that the process adopted and the manner under which it has been managed is extremely questionable and potentially self-serving. The proposed redrawing of the limits to development has no basis for support.</p> <p>In the same manner the proposed Local Green Space assignment appears arbitrary and again self-serving and should be reassessed by an independent and appropriately qualified panel</p>	<p>The site in question has been reassessed and the boundary adjusted to concentrate on the area with the greatest environmental significance, removing the most environmentally significant area and leaving this open to potential future development on review of the NP.</p>	
14	7A Strategy	S2 Limits to Dev	Resident	<p>As co-owner of a large plot of land within the village of Tur Langton (area 240) I feel obliged to raise a number of concerns regarding the aforesaid Tur Langton Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>There appears to be an issue with the management and development of the Neighbourhood Plan and the process of identifying suitable locations and plots for residential development.</p> <p>The communication and notification process seems to be missing certain correspondence, thus raising questions as to why certain recommendations are made whilst others are discounted.</p> <p>On July 9<sup>th</sup> 2015, a meeting of the council was held and as land owner, notification came to myself firstly via neighbours and secondly by TLPC. This was held within a week of receiving notification and as such, I was unable to attend. Had the Council offered more advanced notice, I would have most certainly been in attendance. I am under the belief that Mr. Nick Atkin followed up after this meeting requesting both information and plans, along</p>	<p>The response from comment 13 applies to this comment too.</p>	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>with the outcome from both the Clerk and Chairperson, only to be informed that the meeting was merely information sharing with no outcome available.</p> <p>In 2016, we were contacted to see if we would wish to propose land within the village for a small residential development. It was confirmed that the land in question (area 240) could be included in the village plan, and would be beneficial to the village as a whole. However, at a meeting in 2017 the land had been omitted from inclusion to areas of proposed development. Upon asking TLPC why the omission of our land occurred, I was informed it was an 'error'. I tried again sending details of the land directly to the Chairperson yet the problem still persists. The current plan you have produced still includes no reference to our land and the statement in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan document clearly contains false information as you state on page 23 'no other sites were put forward or considered'. This is clearly untrue as we have made you aware on numerous occasions that we would like our land to be included. We have documented correspondence pertaining to these occasions and we would like to know why, after being assured we would be included and considered, we are still being discounted and ignored; as of yet, no solid reason as to our lack of inclusion has been given.</p> <p>The land proposed is more than suitable for a limited development. Unlike alternative sites that have been used in the recent past, it possesses the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The access directly from Cranoe Road has both good visibility and access, so would cause no problems to vehicles entering and exiting.</li> <li>• Any development would follow the natural property line along Cranoe Road and would be an obvious extension of the village; it is located next to the village and near existing houses.</li> <li>• Of all the roads in Tur Langton, Cranoe Road has the</li> </ul>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	<p><b>7C</b> Natural and Historic Environment</p>	<p><b>ENV 1</b> Protection of Local Green Spaces</p>		<p>lowest flow of traffic at any given time in the day, and thus would not add further congestion to other busy roads in the village.</p> <p>I am certain I need not remind you of the dangers other sites face, including the location being on a junction of the busy B6047 road, which has had a number of fatalities due to poor visibility and speed.</p> <p>I feel compelled to mention that the plan attempts to classify the land in question (area 240) as a Local Green Space. It can be said that you have excluded other sites from this classification, although they are far more suitable. There does not appear to be any objective assessment as to why TLPC is proposing this site over others as a Local Green Space other than perhaps to avoid the limited development that I have proposed above.</p> <p>The assessment that you have made appears to be poorly thought through and contradictory. For example site 2 (area 240) has been excluded and put forward as a space for limited development. Site 1, from area 239, has also conveniently been excluded whilst the rest of area 239 has been classified as a Local Green Space. I am unsure as to how these two sites (1 and 2), can be classified as something different to the rest of the areas (239 and 240) they fall on. The sites occupy the same land, with exactly the same characteristics, yet can be classified as something completely different. I reject the notion that area 240 becomes a Local Green Space and will continue to appeal any attempt to make this assessment.</p> <p>I conclude that the entire process for identifying suitable land has been poorly managed and has lacked sufficient communication. I would like to raise my concerns in regards to the notion that my land has purposefully been excluded from the Draft Neighbourhood Plan on numerous occasions, with no solid reasoning as to why. As stated previously, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan document states on page 23 'no other sites</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>were put forward or considered'. Although I have submitted this land multiple times, I once again, am putting forward this area of land (area 240) for consideration. The plan raises multiple questions due to obvious biases towards certain areas of land, therefore I would ask that this is reassessed by an independent assessor.</p>		
15			Leicestershire County Council	<p><b>Highways</b>  <b>General Comments</b>  The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be <b>fully</b> funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future</p>	These general comments are noted.	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provide as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk Management</b></p> <p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a</p>		



No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.</li> <li>• Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.</li> <li>• Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.</li> <li>• How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</li> <li>• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the <a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)</a>, <a href="#">Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014)</a> and the <a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance webpage</a>.</p> <p><b><u>Planning</u></b>  <b>Developer Contributions</b>  If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in</p>	<p>This was considered unnecessary given the lack of large-scale development that would trigger such funding.</p> <p>The remaining comments in the response from LCC are general and not</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.  <a href="http://www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf">www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf">www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Mineral &amp; Waste Planning</b>  The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new <a href="#">Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan</a>. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect mineral resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p> <p><b>Education</b>  Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and</p>	<p>specific to Tur Langton.</p>	

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p> <p><b><u>Property</u></b>  <b>Strategic Property Services</b>  No comment at this time.</p> <p><b><u>Adult Social Care</u></b>  It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p><b><u>Environment</u></b>  With regard to the environment and in line with the Governments advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.</p> <p><b><u>Climate Change</u></b>  The County Council through its Environment Strategy and Carbon</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Reduction Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the predicted changes in climate. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the county's resilience to climate change.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b> The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape character areas; LCC's Landscape and Woodland Strategy and the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest 'Streets for All East Midlands ' Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity such as hedgerows and greenways.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p> <p>Contact: <a href="mailto:planningecology@leics.gov.uk">planningecology@leics.gov.uk</a>, or phone 0116 305 4108</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure</b>  Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p> <p>The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating &amp; enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.</p> <p><b>Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with DEFRA if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They therefore should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments “Safeguarding our Soils” strategy, DEFRA have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed</p>		

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.</p> <p><b><u>Impact of Development on Civic Amenity Infrastructure</u></b>  Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and the Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local civic amenity infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.</p> <p><b><u>Communities</u></b>  Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</p> <p>The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.</p> <p><b><u>Economic Development</u></b>  We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.</p>		



No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p><b><u>Superfast Broadband</u></b>  High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps). Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ properties. Consideration for developers to make provision in all new houses regardless of the size of development should be considered.</p> <p><b><u>Equalities</u></b>  While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at:  <a href="http://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf">www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf</a></p>		
16	General		Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	<p>This correspondence offers an initial view on whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in the Regulations, and suggests amendments to aspects of the Plan as currently presented. The following comments are set out in a positive and constructive manner intended to aid the clarity and implementation of the Plan. A completed proforma is attached to this correspondence.</p> <p>In line with this, Savills, on behalf of Merton College, welcomes the opportunity to assist with the preparation of</p>	Noted	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>the Plan which will help shape future development in the area. We note that representatives of the College have already discussed the Plan with the Parish Council. We would welcome the opportunity to hold further meetings with the Parish Council to discuss relevant aspects of the plan in future, as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Site context</b> The College's land interests extend throughout Tur Langton, including sites at Manor Farm and land west of Melton Road (B6047). Currently these sites are predominantly greenfield land, though the College also owns existing built development providing residential and commercial uses also.</p> <p><b>Policy Background</b> A new timetable has been approved for the preparation of the Harborough District Council Local Plan, and includes the publication of a pre-submission plan in September 2017 for consultation. A target submission to the Secretary of State is reported for January 2018. It is, at this stage, envisaged that the Plan will be adopted in October 2018.</p> <p><b>Basic Conditions</b> These representations seek to ensure that the proposed Tur Langton Neighbourhood Plan, in meeting national and local policy guidance, satisfies the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). These conditions include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;</li> <li>• The Plan contributes to the achievement of</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>sustainable development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan has special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special interest;</li> <li>• The Plan has special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area;</li> <li>• The Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area;</li> <li>• The Plan does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations; and</li> <li>• The Plan meets prescribed conditions.</li> </ul> <p>Given the progress and status of the emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan, an assessment of the extent to which the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan meet these basic conditions is premature. This is primarily owing to the need for the distribution of development to be agreed and the resulting growth level assigned to Tur Langton to be established. We would welcome the opportunity to consider these matters with the Parish Council at a relevant point in future as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Tur Langton Neighbourhood Plan 2031</b></p> <p>It is recognised that progress on the Plan is the culmination of extensive work over the past couple of years. The Plan itself recognises that Harborough District Council is currently in the process of preparing a robust evidence base to inform its own emerging Local Plan, with reference to updating housing need across the District and the allocation of housing within it. The Neighbourhood Plan is, however, required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained</p>	<p>Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan takes the emerging Local Plan and its evidence base into account but is written to be in general conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy as is required by the NP Regulations.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>within the wider development plan for the District, and should therefore respond to relevant emerging policies. As above, it is expected that consultation on a pre-submission Local Plan will take place during Autumn 2017, with adoption in Autumn 2018.</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan consultation precedes the publication of the Harborough District Council Local Plan. On this basis the College respectfully requests the opportunity to provide further comment on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, pending review of relevant policies within the emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this possibility, we set out below comments for consideration by the Parish Council in the ongoing preparation of the Tur Langton Neighbourhood Plan. For clarity, we use the same headings as provided in the draft consultation paper as published. (16 – 24 Below)</p> <p>The comments are intended to be provided in a constructive manner to help support the preparation of the Plan. The College is keen to work with the Parish Council to take forward a comprehensive neighbourhood plan that will be used in shaping development in the village across the plan period. The matters raised above are considered key in assisting with the preparation of a robust neighbourhood plan. Following the publication of the emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan, we welcome the opportunity to hold further meetings with the Parish Council, as appropriate.</p> <p>We look forward to discussing these comments with you in due course. If you do have any immediate questions relating to the above, please do not hesitate to contact</p>	<p>There will be further formal opportunity for comment at Regulation 16 stage.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				Naomi Hubbard at nhubbard@savills.com Wytham Court 11 West Way Oxford OX2 0QL T: +44 (0) 1865 269 000		
17	<b>5 Vision</b>		Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	<b>A Vision for Tur Langton</b> The College supports the aims and scope of the proposed vision statement for Tur Langton, including broad support for its objectives. These include supporting sensitive development within the built-up area within the updated limits to development to meet local need, and to support the employment area in Tur Langton where there is no detrimental impact on local amenity.	Noted	None
18		<b>S1</b> Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	The provisions of this policy reflect those of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), and relevant Local Plan policies, including those expected in the emerging Local Plan. In this respect, the College supports Policy S1 and the Plan's commitment to taking a positive approach that reflects this presumption	Noted	None
19		<b>S2</b> Limits to Development	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	The College supports the general principle of revision to the limits to development at Tur Langton to deliver required housing and employment growth, subject to design and amenity considerations. The Plan clearly sets out the methodology in updating the limits to development, noting at (c) that the boundary has been relaxed to allow for future expansion to meet need for housing growth over the plan period. The College owns land currently proposed within these revised limits, and welcomes the opportunity to deliver housing growth as appropriate.  With reference to the 'Housing Location Process' Paper, sites 1, 3 and 4 are noted as the best performing sites in respect of providing development potential. It is these sites that have been carried forward to the Submission version of the Neighbourhood	Noted  Noted.  Support for development on land	None  None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Plan, reflected by the amendment proposed in regards to the 'limits to development' boundary. The College owns Sites 3 and 4 and supports the principle of development on its land.</p> <p>Harborough District Council's assessment of Site 5 is reported, via the 'Housing Location Process' Paper as being 'too far out'. However, Site 5 lies immediately north of Site 4. Site 4 is reported as 'most suitable, relates better to built form of village'. There is an inconsistency in assessment here and it is the view of the College that Site 5 is also well suited to delivering a sustainable form of development. The alignment of Kibworth Road, coupled with the limited extent of vegetation on its northern boundary, means that a technically feasible access would be achievable at this location. The College wishes to highlight the suitability of this parcel for development, noting it received a proportion of local support (Housing Location Process Paper), in addition to Site 4 identified.</p> <p>Notwithstanding it is noted that earlier iterations of the emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan propose the removal of settlement limits altogether, and their replacement with specific settlement development policies using a criteria-based approach. To be considered 'sound' there should be consistency between the Neighbourhood Plan and the strategic development policies contained within the wider development plan for the District. We consider that a criteria-based policy would be sufficient in delivering appropriate development in the village, in line with national planning policy and overarching sustainability credentials.</p> <p>On behalf of the College, we therefore strongly recommend review of this policy (with specific reference to the appropriateness of settlement boundaries, given the potential for an alternative approach set out in the emerging Local Plan) to ensure conformity with the wider planning policy context at district level, including the emerging Harborough District Council Local</p>	<p>owned by the College is welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. The review of the Limits to Development as a result of Regulation 14 comments has seen a reduction in potential housing areas and the removal of site 4. This can be subject to review in line with the provisions contained within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We disagree with this judgement. It is an accepted principle within neighbourhood planning that Limits to Development are a matter of detail and not strategy (as confirmed through NP's within the District that have passed Examination with revised Limits to Development (i.e. Hungarton, Great Easton, North Kilworth) and are</p>	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				Plan. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further comment on this matter following review of the Local Plan consultation, expected in September 2017.	therefore in general conformity with the adopted Core Strategy and therefore 'sound'.	
20		<b>S3</b> <i>Development proposals outside the defined limits of development</i>	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	As above, we consider that further review of this policy (with specific reference to the appropriateness of settlement boundaries, given the potential for an alternative approach set out in the emerging Local Plan) would be prudent. We respectfully request the opportunity to provide further comment in due course.	As above. The inclusion of revised Limits to Development within NPs is a matter of accepted practice irrespective of their retention within new Local Plans.	None
21		<b>H1</b> Windfall Sites	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	<p>The College considers that the provisions of Policy H1 are too prescriptive insofar as they restrict development proposals up to three dwellings only, as infill or redevelopment within the revised limits to development. It is considered that a more appropriate strategy may be to allow for an appropriate scale and quantum of development, with the proposed number of dwellings reflecting local need as may be relevant at the time of any given proposal. This is particularly true of smaller housing schemes, where identified sites may accommodate more dwellings, and where provision of only three dwellings may not adequately meet local need.</p> <p>It is further noted that at present no specific policy mechanism is proposed to allow for the delivery of housing development. The College considers the allocation of specific sites for housing delivery to be an important step in planning for growth over the plan period, rather than relying exclusively on the delivery of windfall sites within identified limits.</p> <p>Again, the College would like to provide further comment on the proposed limits to development following review of the emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan consultation paper, to</p>	<p>We are pleased to engage with Merton College as key landowners over the Plan period.</p> <p>There is no requirement on the Parish to allocate sites for development in view of its position within the hierarchy.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Parish Council has taken the opportunity to identify preferred locations for residential development through consultation with the community and Local</p>	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				ensure consistency and conformity with other relevant plan policies.	<p>Planning Authority.</p> <p>The site capacity of 3 has been determined through consideration of the size of the village and range of services within the windfall definition of up to 4 houses contained within the emerging Local Plan. Larger Parishes (i.e. Great Easton) which are higher up in the settlement hierarchy have had similar restrictions pass Examination.</p>	
22		<b>H2</b> Housing Mix	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	<p>The College agrees that proposals for housing development should demonstrate, within reason and based on need and market demand, how proposals would meet current and future needs. Nevertheless it is considered that a wider remit of housing need not exclusively limited to the parish be reflected in any proposed policy.</p> <p>The principle of providing a mix of housing on sites is supported where appropriate to specific sites. It is acknowledged that some local need relates to smaller two-three bedroom dwellings, with larger homes not comprising a majority on any single site. It is, however, noted that the extent to which a mix of dwellings can be provided on small scale sites (i.e. up to three units as proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan) is dependant on site characteristics. The scale and volume of development which may be achieved on site is also dependant upon market demand and developer intentions. Too prescriptive a requirement could prevent or preclude site</p>	Noted. It is considered that the policy appropriately reflects the need to meet local need whilst having regard for commercial considerations.	None.



No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				delivery		
23		<b>H3</b> Building Design Principles	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	This policy details a comprehensive list of criteria for all new development proposals of one or more houses in respect of the building design principles sought by the Parish Council. Detailed comment is not provided at this stage. However the College generally agrees with the approach taken in respect of the pursuit of good design, including reinforcing local distinctiveness and character of the area, a consistent design approach in the use of materials, and the minimisation of visual (and other) impacts on existing character in Tur Langton. It is noted that the listed criteria should be consistent with relevant design criteria set out in the emerging Local Plan. As elsewhere, this policy should be reviewed against relevant emerging policies once made available for consultation.	Noted. Support for the approach to building design from the major land owner in the parish is welcome.	None.
24		<b>H4</b> Phasing of Development	Savills on behalf of Merton College (landowner)	The Neighbourhood Plan proposes that no development of more than one windfall site shall come forward at the same time, in order to phase development over the plan period; with a clear gap of at least four years between the completion of one site and the commencement of another. This policy is considered highly onerous, and one which will be extremely difficult to implement. As outlined elsewhere in this correspondence, the College supports sustainable development in Tur Langton. However this policy would unnecessarily preclude delivery of sustainable development and would, in so doing, conflict with the principles of sustainable development and existing provisions of the NPPF. It is also noted that the Plan seeks to respond to local need. This policy is inappropriate in achieving this aim, as it would unduly stagger housing delivery, irrespective of any identified need that may arise. The College considers that, respectfully, this policy should be reviewed.	Noted. In view of the decision to reduce the available sites suitable for development from 3 to 2, the policy on phasing has been withdrawn.	Policy withdrawn.
25		<b>ENV8:</b> Sustainable Development	Savills on behalf of Merton College	The College supports the thrust of this policy, acknowledging the Parish Council's desire to incorporate climate change mitigation measures into design proposals. It is generally supported that new development should be of an appropriate scale for the size,	Noted. The consideration of live-work units is welcomed and the	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			(landowner)	<p>character and level of other facilities, the built environment and services in the Tur Langton Parish.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan reports the proportion of home working in the village, with Policy CF3 seeking new employment opportunities. The principle of live-work units is one way to secure appropriate alternative employment facilities. Subject to feasibility, the College is willing to consider the delivery of live-work units as part of future development proposals.</p> <p>It is respectfully requested that these above matters are informed by further discussion with the Parish Council as necessary. Detailed comment on the below policies is not provided at this stage, although the College respectfully requests opportunity to comment should these policies be revised in later iterations of the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ENV1 – Protection of Local green Spaces</li> <li>• ENV2 – Protection of Other Sites of Environmental Significance</li> <li>• ENV3 – Important woodland, trees, and hedges</li> <li>• ENV4 – Biodiversity</li> <li>• ENV5 - Ridge and Furrow Fields</li> <li>• ENV6 – Important Views</li> <li>• ENV7 – Footpaths and Bridleways</li> <li>• ENV9 – Rivers and Flooding</li> <li>• CF1 – The Retention of Community Facilities</li> <li>• CF2 – New or Improved Community Facilities</li> <li>• CF3 – Support for Employment Opportunities</li> <li>• CF4 – Broadband Infrastructure</li> <li>• CF5 – Working from Home</li> </ul>	Parish Council will be pleased to engage in further discussion with Merton College as the detail of development is considered.	
26	<b>5 Vision</b>		Harborough District Council (HDC)	Should be time limited	Agreed.	Amend text to 'The vision for Tur Langton is that <b>by 2031</b> the

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
						Parish remains ...'
27		<b>S1</b> Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	HDC	Should this be in the text – noting previous examiners comments for other NDPs? Recent examinations have suggested this is not required	Recent examinations have also retained this policy ... suggest retaining the words but removing the policy.	Amend the NP as suggested.
28		<b>S2</b> Limits to Development	HDC	Clarify development proposals for housing?	The LtD apply to housing development	Amend policy to say 'Residential development proposals ...'
29	Page 24 first para		HDC	Repeated statement	Agreed.	Remove 'including any small groups of buildings or small settlements'.
30		<b>S3</b> <i>Development proposals outside the defined limits of development</i>		Is this policy necessary? Just states LP and National policy.	We believe that this policy is necessary to reinforce the difference between the response to development proposals within and outside the LtD.	None
31		<b>H3</b> Building Design Principles	HDC	This policy is onerous on developers and house builders and may be questioned by an Examiner if it reduces viability. Consider whether existing policy is sufficient and seek to clarify with a simple statement that development should enhance local character etc. c) parking requirements should have evidence if they depart from the design guidance as used by LCC highways and DM currently g) Can this be better phrased to incorporate features that promote biodiversity?	Agreed in relation to moving the text into an appendix.  The policy is not considered too onerous as it requires developers to 'have regard ...' for the	Move detailed design principles to an appendix and amend policy to refer to this.  c) add in 'in

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p><i>(Separate comment under this policy)</i> Too detailed, it might be better to have a shorter policy and refer to a detailed appendix.</p>	<p>design principles listed rather than requiring them all to be applied. The major land owner in the parish supports the policy.</p>	<p>line with LCC policy.'</p> <p>g) replace 'enhanced by' with 'incorporate features that promote ...'</p>
32		<p><b>ENV3</b> Important woodland, trees and hedges</p>	HDC	<p>Map of trees and hedges may be not considered precise enough.</p> <p>Need to reword to say that development should seek to preserve these trees and hedgerows and where damage is unavoidable replacements should be planted</p> <p>The 'not supported' is poor wording.</p>	<p>Higher resolution maps will be provided in the submission version.</p> <p>Re: trees and hedgerows, amend as proposed.</p>	<p>Amend to say 'development should seek to preserve these trees and hedgerows and where damage is unavoidable replacements should be planted'.</p>
33		<p><b>ENV6</b> Important Views</p>	HDC	<p>Important views are apparently difficult to get through Examination. <a href="#">See examples from Great Easton and North Kilworth</a>. Suggest that the views are photographed, and these are included in the evidence base. Photographs at different times of year may be useful as evidence. The policy map and the evidence supporting it need to be sufficiently robust to be used when determining planning applications. A development may impact significantly on a view but will that always be detrimental?</p> <p><i>(Separate comment under this policy).</i> Strongly resisted is not a good planning wording. There are so many views it is difficult to see how the policy can be applied. It might be better worded... Development should respect the views into and out of Tur</p>	<p>Agreed . The Parish Council has agreed to delete the policy</p>	<p>Policy deleted.</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				Langton, to maintain the connection with the rural hinterland.		
34	Profile Page 13 paragraph 2		HDC	<b><u>Housing Enabling and Community Infrastructure Officer comment</u></b> There is mention of an affordability issue on page 13 but nothing more specific than that. Please find attached HDC's AH guidance note which should aid their consideration towards affordable housing.	The most recent development at the former Bull's Head site failed to attract any affordable housing providers as partners. The policy on housing mix is to be amended to incorporate support for rental units by way of offering more affordable options.	Policy on housing mix to incorporate support for rental units.
35	Section 3 Profile		HDC	The profile does not include much information on the population age distribution	The detail is provided in the Census analysis and housing needs report in the supporting information.	None.
36		<b>H1</b> Windfall Sites	HDC	Commentary suggest windfall of up to 4 dwellings, but policy states up to 3, this should be evidenced.	Policy does not state up to 4 – this figure is contained within the draft Local Plan.  A threshold of 3 is considered appropriate for a Village the size of Tur Langton. A bigger settlement (Great Easton) recently passed Examination with a windfall limit of 2.	None

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>What does single fronted dwellings mean? If it is a corner, it would be good design to follow the corner.</p> <p><b><u>Development Management Officer Comments</u></b>            In our view the village is not a sustainable rural village, therefore, in accordance with the NPPF, no residential development should take place. HDC Policy CS17 is significantly non-compliant with the NPPF.            Point c - Also not sure what single fronted development is? Do they mean that they do not want tandem development?            Clarification may be required in the text.</p>	<p>‘Single fronted dwellings’ were recommended by HDC within feedback provided on the suitability on potential development sites.</p> <p>The Parish Council is disappointed with this response as it has sought to produce a neighbourhood plan that supports the principle of sustainable development.</p> <p>In fact, a residential development of six dwellings achieved planning permission within the past three years, demonstrating that development does take place locally under the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>As the comment above from HDC states – the emerging</p>	<p>Add ‘where appropriate’ after ‘involves single-fronted dwellings’.</p> <p>None</p>

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
					<p>Local Plan has a policy on windfall that applies to villages in the same settlement hierarchy as Tur Langton., so development is to be promoted once the new Local Plan is in place.</p> <p>However, in view of this and other comments, the scope for new residential development will be reduced and subject to a review to be triggered when housing need changes.</p>	
37	Section 5 Vision Objectives		HDC	Built environment bullet 2 seems to be a follow on of bullet one and is not an objective as worded	We think that supporting development within the limits to development IS an objective of the NP.	None.
38		<b>H2</b> Housing Mix	HDC	Wording, will be supported, is rather woolly. It might be better to reword. Something like... Developments comprising housing of 3 or fewer bedrooms will be permitted on sites that meet the policies of this plan. Dwellings with 4+ bedrooms will only be permitted where local need is adequately evidenced.	The Examiner of the Great Easton NP, quoted below by HDC with reference to the policy on views, commented as follows in relation to the use of the word 'permitted'. He said	

No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
					<p>'However, the use of the phrase "will be permitted" in Policy H3 runs the risk of pre-determining the planning application process, as it fails to allow for all relevant considerations. We would prefer to retain the use of the word 'support' therefore.</p> <p>The policy phrasing in relation to the proposed mix is helpful and an amendment is therefore agreed.</p>	<p>Developments comprising housing of 3 or fewer bedrooms will be supported on sites that meet the policies of this Plan. Dwellings with 4+ bedrooms will only be permitted where local need is adequately evidenced.'</p>
39	General		HDC	References should be included at the end of the document, not within sections.	Noted.	None
40		<b>ENV1</b> Protection	HDC	Doesn't really make sense. It should say – "the following sites are designated as local green spaces... list...No development will be	The words used in the policy reflect the	None



No	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		of Local green Spaces		permitted on these sites in very special circumstances.” These sites are very large, is there sufficient evidence to realistically support their designation?	amendment to a LGS policy proposed by an Examiner (Hungarton) and is an accurate representation of that policy amendment. The assessment of sites has been undertaken based on the NPPF criteria and each site selected has been scored based on	
41		<b>ENV7</b> Footpaths and Bridleways	HDC	Not supported is unclear, suggest rewording as, “existing footpaths and rights of way must be preserved, any development that impacts on rights of way must ensure that adverse impacts are minimised and that any loss is replaced by alternative routes”	Thank you. This is a helpful revision.	Policy to be amended as proposed.
42		<b>ENV9</b> Rivers and Flooding	HDC	The paragraph about NPPF is misleading and I am not sure is an accurate representation of national policy. Leicestershire CC are the Lead Local Flood Authority and have oversight of surface water flooding – development should take this into account, although small windfall will not necessarily have to include Suds. Figure 11 would be better if it covered the village, not the whole parish.	Noted – the paragraph above the policy will be deleted. The policy will remain the same.	Part of the narrative to be deleted. Amendment to map to be made.

## Comment 8 additional information



The red line depicts the proposed Limits to Development within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The blue line depicts the garden boundary enjoyed by the respective Tur Langton residents.

We request the Neighbourhood Plan boundary is extended to the blue line to closer reflect the garden usage.

Comment 10 photographs



Garden looking north



House from field looking north



House from field looking south



House from field looking south

**Comment 10 photographs continued**



**Looking along fence north**



**Looking south along fence**



**Looking south**



**North end of garden looking into field**

Comment 33 additional papers

Great Easton NDP				
Policy	Name	Submission version policy	Examiner recommendations	Reasons for recommendations
NHE6	Protection of views of landscape and community	<p>Policy NHE6 - Development that impacts in any way on the following locally important and valued views (map, figure 9, below) will be strongly resisted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Panoramic views southwest and northeast from the high ground on the lane to Eyebrook Reservoir</li> <li>ii. Southeast into and over the village from Bush House Farm</li> <li>iii. West from Holt View (start of footpath B66) across open countryside toward Nevill Holt</li> <li>iv. Southwest from Stockerston Road at north end of village</li> <li>v. North up Church Bank toward the parish church, characteristic green verges and sunken roadway</li> <li>vi. Southeast from Church Bank down High Street to the war memorial and out of the village</li> <li>vii. Southeast along Brook Lane towards Barnsdale, green verges, village brook and banks, mature trees, vernacular architecture</li> <li>viii. Northeast along Barnsdale into the village centre, vernacular architecture and layout</li> <li>ix. Southeast from Barnsdale at entry to the village toward Welland valley water</li> </ul>	<p>Delete Policy NHE6</p> <p>Delete supporting text on page 51 and 52</p> <p>Delete Figure 9</p>	<p>Policy NHE6 is an imprecise Policy.</p> <p>Policy NHE6 seeks to "strongly resist" development that impacts on named views "in any way."</p> <p>It is unclear why development that might have a positive impact on views would not be supported. The named "views" are vague, comprising shading on a plan and short, wide-ranging descriptions. They lack precision and without evidence to the contrary, they may change on an annual, seasonal or event hourly basis.</p> <p>Policy NE5 could serve to place a major hurdle in the way of sustainable development coming forward.</p>

		meadows and Rockingham x. Panoramic views southeast from Caldecott Road over water meadows to Rockingham Castle and the hills beyond		
--	--	---	--	--

North Kilworth NDP				
Policy	Name	Submission version policy	Examiner recommendations	Reasons for recommendations
NK22	IMPORTANT OPEN VIEWS AND VISTAS	<p>Development proposals that affect the identified important views and vistas (as shown in Proposals Map, figure 4) will be required to respect and enhance this by ensuring that the visual impact of development on these views is carefully controlled.</p> <p>a) Views from Stoney across and beyond to the Jurassic clay ridge known as the Northamptonshire heights;</p> <p>b) Views from South Kilworth across open paddocks towards the undulating roofline of the Village;</p> <p>c) Street vistas down High Street toward War Memorial; from Pincet Lane towards the White Lion; and along Dag Lane towards the Church; and</p> <p>d) Views across paddocks east towards North Kilworth Hall.</p>	Policy NK22, change to “Development proposals should respect the open views and vistas identified below and in Figure 4: (List a) to d) here)”	<p>Little in the way of substantive information in respect of these “views” is provided. Views are subject to change with the seasons, the weather and even the time of day. Furthermore, different people may have different opinions of what is important about any one particular view.</p> <p>It is not clear how it is possible or viable for all development to enhance the named “views.” Similarly, it is not clear how the “visual impact” of development on these views can be “carefully controlled.”</p> <p>As set out, Policy NK22 does not have regard to Paragraphs 173 and 193 of</p>

				the Framework, and does not provide a decision maker with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal.
--	--	--	--	---